

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/616,064	JANIK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Roy M. Punnoose	2877	

All Participants:

(1) Roy M. Punnoose.

(2) Attorney Jeanette S. Harms (Reg. No. 35,537).

Status of Application: Allowed

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 27 April 2006
Time: 7:15 PM
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

See below with regard to claim 48

Claims discussed:

48

Prior art documents discussed:

None.

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Attorney Jeanette S. Harms. Attorney Harms agreed to cancel claim 48 because of the ambiguity created by the recitation "cleaning beam and metrology operation share a common optical path." Upon the examiner's indication of the allowability of the remaining claims, Attorney Harms opted to cancel claim 48 reserving the right to file a continuation if the applicant decided to do so. Claim 48 has been cancelled.